

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-11 and 32-54 are pending in the application; claims 6, 7, 36, 46 and 52 are objected to; and claims 1-5, 8-11, 32-35, 37-45, 47-51, 53 and 54 are rejected. By this response, claims 1, 5, 32, 37, 44-45, 48-49, and 51 have been cancelled and claims 2, 6, 8, 10-11, 33-35, 38, 46-47, 50, and 52-54 have been amended. Thus, claims 2-4, 6-11, 33-36, 38-43, 46-47, 50, and 52-54 are pending in the application.

Allowable Claims

The Examiner has stated that claims 6, 7, 35, 36, 46, and 52 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6, 35, 46, and 52 have been place into independent form including all the limitation of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 7 and 36 are dependent on respective amended independent claims 6 and 35 and are now believed to be place into allowable form. Accordingly, the objection to claims 6, 7, 35, 36, 46, and 52 is believed to be overcome and withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 48-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 48 and 51 have been cancelled. The recited language from claim 48 "...to encourage stacking..." and claim 51 "...the helical array..." have been changed, and in the amended claim, language has been incorporated into currently amended independent claim 52, which has been indicated as being allowable if put in independent form. Claims 49-50 and 52-54 were rejected as being dependent on indefinite language in claims 48 and 51, respectively. Cancellation of such claims and incorporation of amended language into independent claim 52 is believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Hence, Applicants assert that claims 48-54 overcome the §112, second paragraph, rejection, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C., §102

Claims 1-5, 8-11, 37-45, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Fauchard* (U.S. Patent 4,984,678). Claims 32-34, 48, and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Halahan* (U.S. Patent 2,849,099). Claims 48-51 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Cadwallader* (U.S. Patent 6,564,925). Claims 1, 5, 32, 37, 44-45, 48-49, and 51 have been cancelled. Claims 2, 6, 8, 10-11, 33-35, 38, 46-47, 50, and 52-54 have been amended to

Application Serial No. 10/701,700
Amendment dated 1/31/2006 in
Response to Office Action dated 08/01/2005

place the claims in dependent form relative to claims that have been indicated as having allowable subject matter. Accordingly, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) to claims 1-5, 8-11, 32-34, 37-45, 47-51, and 53-54 is believed to be overcome.

Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For all the reasons advanced above, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance, and action to that end is respectfully requested. If the Examiner's next anticipated action is to be anything other than a Notice of Allowance, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone interview before issuance of any such subsequent action.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/31/06

By: 

Keith D. Grzelak
Reg. No. 37,144